



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/744,612	03/09/2001	Sami Uskela	617-010120-US	1625
2512	7590	06/24/2004	EXAMINER	
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			ZEWDU, MELESS NMN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2683	12

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/744,612

Applicant(s)

USKELA, SAMI

Examiner

Meless N Zewdu

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment (D)

1. This action is in response to the communication filed on 4/1/04.
2. Claims 1-13 are pending in this action.

Drawings

Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference character(s) mentioned in the description: MSC 44. Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the

examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (US 5,940,762).

Regarding claim 1: Lee discloses a method for performing handover of a mobile station communicating in a first call via a first network to communication in a second call via a second network (see abstract; figs. 2A-2D; col. 7, lines 19-67), comprising:

generating a request for handover (abstract; col. 5, lines 49-65; col. 6, lines 33-59).

establishing the second call between the first network and the mobile station via the second network (abstract; figs. 2A-2D; col. 8, lines 29-58, particularly lines 50-58). The prior art of intersystem soft handoff shows that a second intersystem link is connected while the first intersystem link is still active.

transferring data communication between the mobile station and the first network from the first call to the second call (see abstract; col. 7, lines 40-67).

Art Unit: 2683

Regarding claim 2: Lee discloses the step of releasing the first call after data communication between the mobile station and the first network has been transferred from the first call to the second call (see col. 8, lines 59-62). Terminating a call properly transferred is same as releasing the call.

Regarding claim 4: Lee discloses a method wherein the first network generates the request for handover (see col. 6, lines 33-59).

Regarding claim 7: Lee discloses a method wherein the first network originates the second call (see col. 6, lines 33-59).

As per claim 12: Lee discloses a method wherein the first and second networks are cellular telephone networks (see abstract; col. 4, lines 18-40).

As per claim 13: Lee discloses a method wherein the mobile station is capable of communicating by radio with the first and second networks (see abstract; col. 5, lines 13-30; col. 6, lines 34-59).

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Duran et al. (Duran) (US 6,115,608).

Regarding claim 3: but, Lee does not explicitly teach about a method wherein the mobile station generates the request for handover, as claimed by applicant. However, in a related field of endeavor, -- "Intersystem Handover Method and Apparatus" --, Duran teaches that a mobile station is capable of initiating intersystem handover/handoff (see col. 3, lines 33-53; col. 7, lines 45-51; col. 10, lines 18-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 2683

modify the teaching of Lee with that of Duran for the advantage of the mobile station to monitor/detect and store the signal quality of nearby stations to make a decision as to when and to which BTS to handover.

Regarding claim 5: Duran, teaches a method wherein the mobile station originates the second call (see col. 3, lines 33-53; col. 7, lines 45-51; col. 10, lines 18-67). Since, the key question here is a mobile originating handoff request, the feature of claim 5 is similar to the feature of claim 3. Hence, claim 5 is rejected on the same ground and motivation as claim 3. **Explanation:** In Lee the mobile unit communicates with different systems simultaneously in intersystem soft handoff. In Duran, the mobile unit is shown to have initiated intersystem handoff. When the references are combined, the mobile unit would be able to initiate intersystem handoff via any of the BTS in either of the systems involved in the intersystem handoff. In other words, the key feature is the capability of the system wherein the mobile is enabled to communicate simultaneously with a first and second systems.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Houde et al. (Houde) (US 6,081,705)).

As per claim 8: but, Lee does not explicitly teach about a method wherein the mobile station transmits its identification in the second network to the first network and the first network uses that identification in originating the second call, as claimed by applicant. However, in a related field of endeavor, Houde teaches about a cellular telephone network that supports international mobile identity (IMSI) (see abstract; col. 2, lines 1-20; col. 3, line 51-col. 4, line 28; col. 6, line 30-58; col. 8, line 40-col. 9, line 9).

Art Unit: 2683

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a unique international mobile identification number (MIN or IMSI) numbers so as to enable international mobile stations acquire services like call delivery and call handoffs (see col. 1, lines 8-12).

Claims 9 and 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sunay et al. (Sunay) (US 6,353,626 B1). For examination purpose, claim 10 is considered first.

As per claim 10: Lee does not explicitly teach about a method wherein the first network is an IMT-2000 network, as claimed by applicant. However, in a related field of endeavor, Sunay teaches the current CDMA cellular system can be evolved into a 3G generation system where it can support a multitude of service like handoffs, PCS, the existing cellular system, packet data services, circuit data service, and IMT-2000 spectrum (see col. 1, lines 14-62. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure/interface Lee's network to/into 3G generation (which supports IMT-2000) for the advantage of the wide performance and operational ranges the system can provide.

As per claim 9: a method wherein the geographical coverage of the second network is grater than the first network reads on '626 (see col. 1, lines 52-57). When the two systems are configured in overlay hierarchy, the overlay will be grater than the underlay.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Menich et al. (Me4nich) (US 6,449,305 B1).

Art Unit: 2683

As per claim 11: Lee does not explicitly teach/disclose about a method wherein the second network is a PDC network, as claimed by applicant. However, in a related field of endeavor, Menich teaches about a handoff technique between different networks that include CDMA, AMPS and PDC (see col. 4, line 65-col. 5, line 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee's reference with the teaching of Menich for the advantage of providing mobile stations handoff services between networks that employ different protocols (see col. 35-48).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meless N Zewdu whose telephone number is (703) 306-5418. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am to 5:00 pm..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on (703) 308-5318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2683

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Meless Zewdu



Examiner

17 June 2004.



WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600